



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/653,201	08/31/2000	Whittle Bryan	00479.00013	4705

7590 09/08/2005

Banner & Witcoff Ltd
1001 G Street NW
Washington, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

MEKY, MOUSTAFA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/653,201

Applicant(s)

BRYAN ET AL.

Examiner

Moustafa M. Meky

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 27-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-30, 32-36, 38-41, 44 and 45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 31, 37, 42, 43 and 46 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

1. The amendment filed 6/21/2005 has been entered and considered by the examiner.
2. Claims 27-46 are presenting for examination.
3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 27-30, 32-36, 38-41, and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Delaney (US Pat. No 6,937,574) which has the priority date of March 16, 1999.
5. As to claim 27, Delaney shows in Fig 1, a system for interconnecting a plurality of virtual private networks VPNs 20, the system comprising:

* a plurality of virtual private networks VPNs 20, each of them inherently (actual VPN operating environment will typically include multiple service providers) having multiple service providers (not shown in the Fig), see col 6, lines 46-54;

- at least one interconnect provider (NSP Network) 10 configured to connect the VPNs 20, see col 1, lines 56-57, col 6, lines 46-54;
- a global overseer 16 inherently configured to ensure end-to-end service quality across VPNs 20 (the global 16 is an exchange point operator EPO that interconnects VPNs 20, therefore, the global 16 would follow the standards/metrics of the TEL-2 02.00 publication in which the global 18A would ensure and satisfy end-to-end quality

requirements across the two VPNs 12 & 14, see the Declaration under 1.132 filed by the applicant on 10/13/2004).

6. As to claim 28, the end-to-end service quality across the VPNs 20 inherently includes maintaining minimum standards for cross network services, as part of the services of the the global 16 that follows the standards/metrics of the TEL-2 02.00 publication, see the Declaration under 1.132 filed by the applicant).

7. As to claim 29, the end-to-end service quality across the VPNs 20 inherently includes maintaining the minimum standards from a first subscriber of one VPN 20 to a second subscriber of another VPN 20 as part of the services of the the global 16 that follows the standards/metrics of the TEL-2 02.00 publication, see the Declaration under 1.132 filed by the applicant).

8. As to claim 30, the end-to-end service quality across the VPNs 20 inherently includes maintaining packet latency, as part of the services of the the global 16 that follows the standards/metrics of the TEL-2 02.00 publication, see the Declaration under 1.132 filed by the applicant).

9. As to claim 32, the end-to-end service quality across the VPNs 20 inherently includes maintaining an operable connection within a max. acceptable period of unavailability between a first subscriber of one VPN 20 to a second subscriber of a second VPN 20 as part of the services of the the global 16 that follows the standards/metrics of the TEL-2 02.00 publication, see the Declaration under 1.132 filed by the applicant).

10. As to claims 33 & 36 each VPN 20 inherently comprises a program overseer configured to ensure end-to-end service quality across its corresponding VPN and to resolve disputes

between providers within its VPN that follows the standards/metrics of the TEL-2 02.00 publication, see the Declaration under 1.132 filed by the applicant.

11. As to claims 34-35, the global overseer 16 is inherently configured to resolve disputes between ones of program oversees and between one of the program overseer and the interconnect provider 10 that follows the standards/metrics of the TEL-2 02.00 publication, see the Declaration under 1.132 filed by the applicant.

12. As to claim 38, the interconnect provider 10 includes interconnect providers 12 to service different VPNs 20.

13. As to claims 39-40, wherein the end-to-end quality inherently includes a quantified end-to-end service quality level that follows the standards/metrics of the TEL-2 02.00 publication, see the Declaration under 1.132 filed by the applicant.

14. As to claim 41, the claim is similar in scope to claim 27, and it is rejected under the same rationale.

15. As to claim 44, providing one exchange point 12 between the first set of providers within one VPN 20 and the interconnect provider 10, see Fig 1.

16. As to claim 45, providing another exchange point 12 between the second set of providers within another VPN 12 and the interconnect provider 10, see Fig 1.

Therefore, it can be seen from paragraphs 5-16 that Delaney anticipates claims 27-30, 32-36, 38-41, and 44-45.

17. Claims 31, 37, 42-43, and 46 are dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

17.1. The prior art of record does not teach:

- end-to-end service quality across multiple ones of the plurality of VPNs includes maintaining the number of multiple service providers below a maximum acceptable number between a first subscriber of one VPN to a second subscriber of another VPN (claim 31);
- pays a fee to the global overseer for maintaining the global overseer and the interconnect provider pays a fee to the global overseer for certification (claim 37);
- the interconnect provider is also one of the multiple service providers within at least one of the VPNs (claim 42);
- the step of certifying the at least one interconnect provider by the global overseer (claim 43); and
- a maximum number of the multiple service providers between two of the subscribers is two and the maximum number of the multiple service providers and the interconnect provider between subscribers of different VPNs is three (claim 46).

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 2157

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Moustafa M Meky whose telephone number is 571-272-4005. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MMM
9/4/2005


MOUSTAFI M. MEKY
PRIMARY EXAMINER